

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): I. Hietanen et al.

Case: 3505-3

Serial No.: 10/523,943

Filing Date: February 8, 2005

Group: 2884

Examiner: Djura Malevic

Title: Packaging Structure for Imaging Detectors

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the Notice of Allowability dated January 22, 2008 in the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance (hereinafter "Statement") given on page 2 of the January 22, 2008 Notice of Allowability. Based on this review, it appears that certain aspects of the Statement may be viewed as mischaracterizing the scope of the allowed claims.

Applicants initially note that while the list of allowed claims on page 1 of the Notice of Allowability is correct (claims 34-68), the Examiner only states that claims 34, 44-46, 48, 52, 63, and 66-68 are allowed on page 2 of the Notice of Allowability. This contradiction is clearly erroneous and Applicants wish to respectfully assert that the former statement is correct, and that all of claims 34-68 are allowed.

The Examiner states that the prior art does not teach Applicants' claimed limitations, but the description given does not accurately reflect the limitations of the claims, said limitations, in claim 34 for example, being:

An array of photodiodes extending in two dimensions and comprising: a plurality of substrates; a corresponding plurality of anodes formed at first surfaces of the plurality of substrates; a corresponding plurality of cathodes formed at second surfaces of the plurality of substrates, wherein a bulk of each substrate is disposed between a corresponding anode and cathode; an electrical interconnection between the plurality of anodes; and a connector interface provided with a corresponding plurality of contacts electrically connected to the respective cathodes for reading output signals provided by the plurality of cathodes.

In summary, Applicants believe that each of claims 34-68 is allowable because the particular limitations thereof are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. To the extent that the Statement includes language which does not accurately reflect the claim limitations, the Statement is respectfully traversed and a request is made for a corrected Statement that accurately reflects the claim limitations.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946

Date: March 17, 2008